IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

NEED ICE DIG

NETLIST, INC., Plaintiff,	§ § §
v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS, CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., and SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., Defendants.	<pre></pre>
NETLIST, INC., Plaintiff,	§ § §
v. MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR PRODUCTS INC., and MICRON TECHNOLOGY TEXAS LLC, Defendants.	<pre> \$ \$ CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-CV-00558-JRG \$ (MEMBER CASE) \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$</pre>

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion to Dismiss Complaint (the "Motion to Dismiss) filed in Member Case No. 2:25-cv-00558-JRG by Defendants Micron Technology, Inc., Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc., and Micron Technology Texas, LLC (collectively, "Micron"). (Case No. 2:25-cv-00558-JRG, Dkt. No. 11.) Since Micron filed the Motion to Dismiss, on July 8, 2025, Plaintiff Netlist Inc. ("Plaintiff") filed the First Amended Complaint against Micron. (Dkt. No. 15.)

It is well established that a later-filed amended complaint moots a motion asking the Court to dismiss an earlier-filed complaint. See Griffin v. Am. Zurich Ins. Co., 697 F. App'x 793, 797 (5th Cir. 2017) ("Once filed, that amended complaint rendered all earlier motions . . . moot,"); see also Bishop Display Tech LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd., Case No. 2:21-cv-00139-JRG, Dkt. No. 40 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 4, 2021) ("Once Plaintiff filed its amended complaint, the Motion became moot."); Ultravision Techs., LLC v. Eaton Corp. PLC, No. 2:19-CV-00290-JRG, 2019 WL 11250161, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 7, 2019) ("Accordingly, the filing of an amended complaint moots a motion to dismiss the original complaint.").

Accordingly, the Court finds that the Motion to Dismiss (Case No. 2:25-cv-00558-JRG, Dkt. No. 11), which is based upon Plaintiff's Original Complaint, should be and hereby is DENIED AS MOOT.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 14th day of August, 2025.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE